

# ON CERTAIN 2-CATEGORIES ADMITTING LOCALISATION BY BICATEGORIES OF FRACTIONS

DAVID MICHAEL ROBERTS

ABSTRACT. Pronk’s theorem on bicategories of fractions is applied, in almost all cases in the literature, to 2-categories of geometrically presentable stacks on a 1-site. We give an proof that subsumes all previous such results and which is purely 2-categorical in nature, ignoring the nature of the objects involved.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The area of *higher geometry* deals broadly with generalisations of ‘spaces’, be they topological, differential geometric, algebro-geometric etc., that can be represented by groupoids (or higher groupoids) in the original category of spaces. Usually these go by the label differential, topological, algebraic etc. stacks, but when viewed as stacks there are more morphisms between objects than when viewed simply as internal groupoids; there are non-invertible maps of groupoids that become equivalences of the associated stacks. Pronk, in [5], formulated what it meant to localise a bicategory at a class of morphisms and introduced a bicategory of fractions that exists under certain conditions in order to construct this localisation. She then went on to show that 2-categories of differentiable, topological and algebraic stacks (of certain sorts) were indeed localisations of the 2-categories of groupoids internal to the appropriate categories.

Since then, many other cases of 2-categorical localisations have been considered, using Pronk’s result applied to other categories (for extensive discussion and examples see [7, §§2,8]). However, almost all of them—only two exceptions are known to the author—deal with internal groupoids and/or stacks in some setting. In this case, the 2-category in question, and the class of morphisms at which one wants to localise, satisfy some properties making available a much simpler calculus of fractions, namely *anafunctors*. These were introduced by Makkai [4] for the category of sets *sans* Choice and in the general internal setting by Bartels [1]. The paper [7] showed that given a sub-2-category  $C \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Cat}(S)$  of the 2-category of categories internal to a subcanonical site  $(S, J)$ , satisfying some closure operations, admitted a bicategory of fractions at the so-called *weak equivalences* (also called *Morita equivalences*), and that anafunctors also calculated this localisation.

This note serves to show that given a 2-category with the structure of a *strict 2-site* of a certain form (for example, all covering maps must be representably fully faithful), the same result holds – namely that the bicategory of fractions of Pronk exists, but there is a simpler way to construct a localisation. One can then

---

*Date:* 3 March 2014.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* primary 18D05; secondary 18F10, 18E35.

*Key words and phrases.* 2-categories, bicategories of fractions, localization, stacks.

DR is supported financially by ARC grant number DP120100106, and emotionally by Mrs R.

approach the theory of geometrically presentable stacks in a formal way, analogous to Street's formal theory of stacks [11] (cf Shulman's [10]). This result covers all others in the literature dealing with localising 2-categories of internal categories or groupoids. It may also replicate the result, in [6], although the framework therein is conceptually more pleasing; The theorems of this note are definitely sufficient to imply the applications of the abstract framework of *loc. cit.*

Sometimes when calculating the localisation of a 2-category of internal groupoids, various authors use what are variously known as *Hilsum-Skandalis morphisms* or *right principal bibundles* (see [7, §2] for discussion and references). In the more general setting of strict 2-sites such a definition is not possible, as it uses the structure of groupoids as a pair of objects with structure maps in a rather specific way. Additionally, composition of 1-arrows in the bicategory of internal groupoids and bibundles requires existence of pullback-stable reflexive coequalisers, an assumption not made here. Also, the definition of a bibundle between internal *categories* is not clear and the right notion of a map of bibundles (i.e. 2-arrows in the localisation) does not appear to be as simple as in the groupoid case.

On a final note, the proofs of the results of this note are stated in such a way to use Pronk's localisation and comparison theorems from [5], but in [8] theorem 3.4 will be reproved in an elementary way in the language of 2-categories, not depending on [5]. This will serve to give an independent proof of the results in the literature that use Pronk's theorem in the setting of geometrically presentable stacks.

The author thanks the organisers of the Australian Category Seminar for the opportunity to present this work.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Though this paper touches lightly on the theory of bicategories, a knowledge of 2-categories is sufficient (an accessible reference is [3]). We consider our 2-categories to have one extra piece of structure, namely an analogue of a Grothendieck pretopology.

**Definition 2.1.** A *totally strict fully faithful subcanonical singleton pretopology* on a 2-category  $K$  is a class  $J$  of 1-arrows satisfying the following properties:

- (i)  $J$  contains the identity arrows and is closed under composition;
- (ii) the *strict* pullback of all 1-arrows in  $J$  exist and are again in  $J$ , and the pullback of an identity 1-arrow is again an identity 1-arrow;
- (iii) for any  $q: u \rightarrow x$  in  $J$  the functor  $q_*: K(z, u) \rightarrow K(z, x)$  is fully faithful;
- (iv) for any  $q: u \rightarrow x$  in  $J$  the following is a *strict* equaliser of categories

$$K(x, y) \xrightarrow{q^*} K(u, y) \rightrightarrows K(u \times_x u, y).$$

In other words,  $q$  is a regular epimorphism in the strictest possible sense.

We will in fact assume that *specified* strict pullbacks are given as part of the data. Morphisms satisfying (iii) above are called *ff 1-arrows*.

For brevity this paper will use the terminology *strict 2-site*, even though this properly denotes something more general. Note that that  $K$  is not necessarily small, but in what follows may be locally essentially small. That is, the hom-categories  $K(x, y)$  are equivalent to small categories for all objects  $x$  and  $y$ .

One should think about the 1-arrows in  $J$  as being something like acyclic fibrations in a category with fibrant objects (and indeed for some examples they are, in the underlying 1-category).

We define the analogue of weak equivalences in this setting.

**Definition 2.2.** A 1-arrow  $x \rightarrow y$  in  $(K, J)$  is called  *$J$ -locally split* if there is a map  $u \rightarrow y$  in  $J$  and a diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & x \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ u & \longrightarrow & y \end{array}$$

with the 2-arrow an isomorphism. A *weak equivalence* in  $(K, J)$  is an ff 1-arrow that is  $J$ -locally split. The class of weak equivalences will be denoted  $W_J$ .

It is an easy result (cf [7, lemma 4.13]) that if one takes the 2-category  $K$  to be  $\mathbf{Cat}(S)$  or  $\mathbf{Gpd}(S)$  for  $(S, J)$  a finitely complete site, or the 2-category of Lie groupoids, then a weak equivalence in the sense of definition 2.2 is the same as a weak equivalence in the sense of [7].

Given a 2-category (or bicategory)  $B$  with a class  $W$  of 1-arrows, we say that a 2-functor  $Q: B \rightarrow \tilde{B}$  is a *localisation of  $B$  at  $W$*  if it sends the 1-arrows in  $W$  to equivalences in  $\tilde{B}$  and is universal with this property. This latter means that for any bicategory  $A$  precomposition with  $Q$ ,

$$Q^*: \mathbf{Bicat}(\tilde{B}, A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Bicat}_W(B, A),$$

is an equivalence of hom-bicategories, with  $\mathbf{Bicat}_W$  meaning the full sub-bicategory on those 2-functors sending arrows in  $W$  to equivalences. The definition of a bicategory of fractions of [5] gives a reasonably convenient way to calculate the localisation at a class of arrows, satisfying some properties as follows:

BF1  $W$  contains all equivalences;

BF2  $W$  is closed under composition and isomorphism;

BF3 for all  $w: a' \rightarrow a$ ,  $f: c \rightarrow a$  with  $w \in W$  there exists a 2-commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p & \xrightarrow{g} & a' \\ \downarrow v & \searrow \simeq & \downarrow w \\ c & \xrightarrow{f} & a \end{array}$$

with  $v \in W$ ;

BF4 if  $\alpha: w \circ f \Rightarrow w \circ g$  is a 2-arrow and  $w \in W$  there is a 1-cell  $v \in W$  and a 2-arrow  $\beta: f \circ v \Rightarrow g \circ v$  such that  $\alpha \circ v = w \circ \beta$ .

Moreover: when  $\alpha$  is an isomorphism, we require  $\beta$  to be an isomorphism too; when  $v'$  and  $\beta'$  form another such pair, there exist 1-cells  $u, u'$  such that  $v \circ u$  and  $v' \circ u'$  are in  $W$ , and an isomorphism  $\epsilon: v \circ u \Rightarrow v' \circ u'$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} f \circ v \circ u & \xRightarrow{\beta \circ u} & g \circ v \circ u \\ \Downarrow f \circ \epsilon \simeq & & \Downarrow \simeq g \circ \epsilon \\ f \circ v' \circ u' & \xRightarrow{\beta' \circ u'} & g \circ v' \circ u' \end{array}$$

Pronk constructed, for a bicategory  $B$  and a class of 1-arrows  $W$  satisfying BF1–BF4, a new bicategory  $B[W^{-1}]$  with a functor from  $B$  that is a localisation of  $B$  at  $W$ . The 1-arrows of this localisation are spans with backwards-pointing legs arrows in  $W$ , and the 2-arrows are certain equivalence classes of diagrams of 2-arrows in  $B$ .

However, one might have a bi- or 2-category that may already be a localisation at a given class of maps, and one wants to show this without resorting to checking the universal property of localisation. This is where the comparison theorem comes in.

**Theorem 2.3** (Pronk, [5]). *A 2-functor  $F : B \rightarrow A$  which sends elements of  $W$  to equivalences induces an equivalence of bicategories*

$$\tilde{F} : B[W^{-1}] \xrightarrow{\sim} A$$

*if the following conditions hold*

*EF1  $F$  is essentially surjective;*

*EF2 for every 1-arrow  $f$  of  $A$  there are 1-arrows  $w \in W$  and  $g$  of  $B$  such that*

$$Fg \xrightarrow{\sim} f \circ Fw;$$

*EF3  $F$  is locally fully faithful.*

As a result, a functor satisfying EF1–EF3 makes  $A$  a localisation of  $B$  at  $W$ . We shall use this in theorem 3.4 to show that there is a simpler calculus of fraction that one can use in the case of strict 2-sites.

### 3. RESULTS

The first main result is as follows:

**Theorem 3.1.** *A strict 2-site  $(K, J)$  admits a bicategory of fractions for  $W_J$ .*

*Proof.* We verify the conditions in the definition of a bicategory of fractions.

BF1 An internal equivalence  $f : x \rightarrow y$  is clearly  $J$ -locally split. Let  $g : y \rightarrow x$  be a pseudoinverse to  $f$ , and let  $w$  be some object of  $K$ . Then  $g_*$  is a pseudoinverse to  $f_*$ , where  $f_* : K(w, x) \rightarrow K(w, y)$  is post-composition with  $f$  (and analogously with  $g_*$ ). But then it is a well-known fact that equivalences of categories are fully faithful, and so  $f$  is a ff 1-arrow.

BF2 That the composition of ff 1-arrows is again ff, and that ff 1-arrows are closed under isomorphism follows from the analogous fact for fully faithful functors between categories. So we only need to show the same for  $J$ -locally split

arrows. Consider the composition  $g \circ f$  of two  $J$ -locally split arrows,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} u & & q & v & \\ \downarrow & \Downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow \\ x & \xrightarrow{f} & y & \xrightarrow{g} & z \end{array}$$

The arrow  $q$  pulls back to an arrow  $u \times_y v \rightarrow v$  in  $J$ . The composite  $u \times_y v \rightarrow z$  is in  $J$ , hence  $g \circ f$  is  $J$ -locally split.

Let  $w, f: x \rightarrow y$  be 1-arrows,  $w$  be  $J$ -locally split and  $a: w \Rightarrow f$  invertible. It is immediate from the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} u & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow u & \\ x & & y \\ & \Downarrow a & \\ & f & \end{array}$$

that  $f$  is also  $J$ -locally split.

BF3 Let  $w: x \rightarrow y$  be a weak equivalence, and let  $f: z \rightarrow y$  be any other 1-arrow. From the definition of  $J$ -locally split, we have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} u & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow q & \\ x & \xrightarrow{w} & y \end{array}$$

We pull  $q$  back along  $f$  to get a 2-commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & u \times_y z & & \\ & \swarrow & & \searrow p & \\ u & & & & z \\ \downarrow & \searrow q & & \swarrow f & \\ x & \xrightarrow{w} & y & & \end{array}$$

with  $p \in W_J$  as required.

BF4 Since  $J$ -equivalences are ff, given

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & y & & \\ & \nearrow f & & \searrow w & \\ x & & & & z \\ & \searrow g & & \nearrow w & \\ & & y & & \end{array}$$

where  $w \in W_J$ , there is a unique  $a': f \Rightarrow g$  such that

$$\begin{array}{c}
 & y & \\
 f \nearrow & & \searrow w \\
 x & & z \\
 g \searrow & & \nearrow w \\
 & y &
 \end{array}
 \Downarrow a
 =
 \begin{array}{c}
 & f & \\
 x & \xrightarrow{\quad} & y \\
 & g & \\
 & \Downarrow a' & \\
 & g &
 \end{array}
 \xrightarrow{w} z .$$

The existence of  $a'$  is the first half of BF4, with  $v = \text{id}_x$ . Note that if  $a$  is an isomorphism, so is  $a'$ , since  $w$  is ff. Given  $v': t \rightarrow x \in W_J$  such that there is a 2-arrow

$$\begin{array}{c}
 & x & \\
 v' \nearrow & & \searrow f \\
 t & & y \\
 v' \searrow & & \nearrow g \\
 & x &
 \end{array}
 \Downarrow b$$

satisfying

$$\begin{array}{c}
 & x & \\
 v' \nearrow & & \searrow f \\
 w & & y \xrightarrow{w} z \\
 v' \searrow & & \nearrow g \\
 & x &
 \end{array}
 \Downarrow b
 =
 \begin{array}{c}
 & y & \\
 f \nearrow & & \searrow w \\
 t \xrightarrow{v'} x & & z \\
 g \searrow & & \nearrow w \\
 & y &
 \end{array}
 \Downarrow a$$

$$(3.1) \quad = t \xrightarrow{v'} x \begin{array}{c} f \\ \Downarrow a' \\ g \end{array} y \xrightarrow{w} z ,$$

then uniqueness of  $a'$ , together with equation (3.1) gives us

$$\begin{array}{c}
 & x & \\
 v' \nearrow & & \searrow f \\
 t & & y \\
 v' \searrow & & \nearrow g \\
 & x &
 \end{array}
 \Downarrow b
 =
 t \xrightarrow{v'} x \begin{array}{c} f \\ \Downarrow a' \\ g \end{array} y .$$

This is precisely the diagram (2.1) with  $v = \text{id}_x$ ,  $u = v'$ ,  $u' = \text{id}_w$  and  $\epsilon$  the identity 2-arrow. Hence BF4 holds.  $\square$

The second main result relies on the notion of  $J$ -span, which is the analogue of an internal anafunctor in the setting of strict 2-sites.

**Definition 3.2.** A  $J$ -span in a strict 2-site  $(K, J)$  is a span  $x \leftarrow u \rightarrow y$  in  $K$  where  $u \rightarrow x$  is in  $J$ . A map of  $J$ -spans from  $x \leftarrow u \xrightarrow{f} y$  to  $x \leftarrow v \xrightarrow{g} y$  is a diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{c} x \longleftarrow u \times_x v \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f \circ \text{pr}_1} \\ \Downarrow \\ \xrightarrow{g \circ \text{pr}_2} \end{array} y \end{array} .$$

In [8] it will be proved that  $J$ -spans in a strict 2-site  $(K, J)$  and maps between them, for fixed  $x, y$ , form a category, and that these are the hom-categories for a bicategory  $K_J$  with the same objects as  $K$ . Suffice it to say that composition of  $J$ -spans, as 1-arrows in  $K_J$ , is just composition of spans as usual, and that  $K$  embeds strictly in  $K_J$  by an identity-on-objects, locally fully faithful 2-functor  $A_J$ . On 1-arrows,  $A_J$  is simply given by  $(f: x \rightarrow y) \mapsto (x \xleftarrow{\text{id}_x} x \xrightarrow{f} y)$ ; on 2-arrows it sends  $a: f \Rightarrow g: x \rightarrow y$  to

$$\begin{array}{c} x \longleftarrow x \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \Downarrow a \\ \xrightarrow{g} \end{array} y \end{array} .$$

It should perhaps be pointed out that 2-arrows are diagrams in  $K$ , rather than equivalence classes of diagrams, making the bicategory  $K_J$  in some respects simpler than Pronk's construction of  $K[W_J^{-1}]$ .

First, a lemma that shows that  $A_J$  can in fact localise at the class of weak equivalences. Note that while the full details of the definition of  $K_J$  are still forthcoming, definition 3.2 is enough to arrive at the necessary result.

**Lemma 3.3.** *The 2-functor  $A_J: K \rightarrow K_J$  sends 1-arrows in  $W_J$  to equivalences.*

*Proof.* Firstly, by proposition 6.4 of [7], we only need to check that 1-arrows in  $J$  are sent to equivalences by  $A_J$ . Given  $q: u \rightarrow x$  in  $J$  we can supply an explicit pseudoinverse for  $A_J(q)$ , namely the  $J$ -span  $x \xleftarrow{q} u \xrightarrow{\text{id}_u} u$ .

The composite  $(\text{id}_u, q) \circ (q, \text{id}_u)$  is the span

$$u \xleftarrow{q \circ \text{pr}_1} u \times_x u \xrightarrow{q \circ \text{pr}_2} u.$$

We need to furnish an invertible 2-arrow  $(q \circ \text{pr}_1, q \circ \text{pr}_2) \Rightarrow (\text{id}_u, \text{id}_u)$ . This will be given by a 2-arrow  $\text{pr}_1 \Rightarrow \text{pr}_2: u \times_x u \rightarrow u$  in  $K$ . However, such a 2-arrow exists as  $q$  is ff, and we can take it to be the lift of the identity 2-arrow through  $q$  of  $u \times_x u \rightarrow u$ . By inspection this is invertible.

Now the composite  $(q, \text{id}_u) \circ (\text{id}_u, q)$  is the span

$$x \xleftarrow{q} u \xrightarrow{q} x.$$

The invertible 2-arrow from this to the span  $(\text{id}_x, \text{id}_x)$  is simply given by the identity 2-arrow of  $q$ . Thus  $A_J(q)$  is an equivalence.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.4.** *For a strict 2-site  $(K, J)$ , the inclusion 2-functor  $A_J: K \rightarrow K_J$  is a localisation at the class  $W_J$  of weak equivalences.*

*Proof.* Let us show the conditions in proposition 2.3 hold. To begin with, the 2-functor  $A_J$  sends weak equivalences to equivalences by lemma 3.3.

EF1  $A_J$  is the identity on objects, and hence surjective on objects.

EF2 This is equivalent to showing that for any  $J$ -span  $x \xleftarrow{q} u \xrightarrow{f} y$  there are 1-arrows  $w, g$  in  $K$  such that  $w$  is in  $W_J$  and

$$(q, f) \xRightarrow{\sim} A_J(g) \circ \overline{A_J(w)}$$

where  $\overline{A_J(w)}$  is some pseudoinverse for  $A_J(w)$ . We can take  $w = q$  and  $g = f$ , since by the proof of lemma 3.3,  $(q, \text{id}_u)$  is a pseudoinverse for  $(\text{id}_u, q)$ , and the composite span of  $(q, \text{id}_u)$  and  $(\text{id}_u, f)$  is just  $(q, f)$ .

EF3 If  $a: (\text{id}_x, f) \Rightarrow (\text{id}_x, g)$  is a map of  $J$ -spans for 1-arrows  $f, g: x \rightarrow y$  of  $K$ , it is given by a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & f & \\ x & \xleftarrow{\text{id}_x} & x \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \Downarrow a' \\ \xrightarrow{g} \end{array} & y \\ & & g \end{array} ,$$

i.e. a 2-arrow of  $K$  such that  $a$  is the image of  $a'$  under  $\alpha_J$ .

Thus  $A_J$  is a localisation of  $K$  at  $W_J$ .  $\square$

As a last remark, one would like to know if the localisation of  $K$  at the weak equivalences is locally essentially small. This can be assured by the following result.

**Proposition 3.5.** *If the locally essentially small strict 2-site  $(K, J)$  is such that, for each object  $x$  of  $K$ , the class of covers of  $x$  has a cofinal set,<sup>1</sup> then  $K_J$  is locally essentially small, and hence so is any localisation of  $K$  at  $W_J$ .*

Notice that local essential smallness is *not* automatic, as there are well-pointed toposes with natural number object—for example those of sets in models of ZF as given by Gitik [12] and Karagila [2], or the author’s [9]—for which the 2-category of internal categories fails the hypothesis of proposition 3.5.

Finally, note that nothing in the above relies on  $K$  being a (2,1)-category, namely one with only invertible 2-arrows. This is usually assumed for results subsumed by theorem 3.1, but is unnecessary in the framework presented here.

## REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bartels. *Higher gauge theory I: 2-Bundles*. Ph.D. thesis, University of California Riverside. arXiv:math.CT/0410328. 2006.
- [2] A. Karagila. ‘Embedding orders into cardinals with  $DC_\kappa$ ’. *Fundamenta Mathematicae* arXiv:1212.4396.
- [3] T. Leinster. ‘Basic bicategories’. arXiv:math.CT/9810017, 1998.
- [4] M. Makkai. ‘Avoiding the axiom of choice in general category theory’. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **108** (1996), 109–173.
- [5] D. Pronk. ‘Etendues and stacks as bicategories of fractions’. *Compositio Math.* **102** (3) (1996), 243–303.
- [6] D. Pronk and M. Warren. ‘Bicategorical fibration structures and stacks’. arXiv:1303.0340, 2013.
- [7] D. M. Roberts. ‘Internal categories, anafunctors and localisation’. *Theory Appl. Categ.* **26** (29) (2012), 788–829. arXiv:1101.2363.
- [8] D.M. Roberts. ‘Strict 2-sites,  $J$ -spans and localisations’. In preparation.
- [9] D.M. Roberts. ‘The weak choice principle WISC may fail in the category of sets’. arXiv:1311.3074, 2013.
- [10] M. Shulman. ‘Exact completions and small sheaves’. *Theory Appl. Categ.* **27** (2012), 97–173.
- [11] R. Street. ‘Two-dimensional sheaf theory’. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **23** (3) (1982), 251–270.

<sup>1</sup>This condition is called WISC in [7] in the setting of ordinary sites.

- [12] Benno van den Berg and Ieke Moerdijk. ‘The axiom of multiple choice and models for constructive set theory’, arXiv:1204.4045, 2012.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE, SA 5005, AUSTRALIA  
*E-mail address:* `david.roberts@adelaide.edu.au`